



REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 31-33 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims in U.S. Pat. No. 5,996,283. A Terminal Disclaimer has been included with this Amendment to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 for being indefinite. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that it is unclear to him how the interior side walls can be "separate from" the exterior side walls, and yet be "nested" in them. The Examiner is referred to Fig. 11 to see how this can be so. The interior walls 357 are nested within the exterior walls 356. Note that the interior walls are clearly separate from the exterior walls, yet still nested within. Accordingly, applicant asserts that the claim is not indefinite, and thus claim 33 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Szapucki et al. (U.S. 5,671,958). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 31, as amended, recites a "a protuberance projecting from each of the side walls, each protuberance having a *pointed apex* spaced from the flange" (Claim 31, lines 7-8; emphasis added). Szapucki does not disclose this element of the claim.

Szapucki discloses a tab 18 with a curved half-cylinder 66. The half-cylinder is not "pointed", which is defined as "ending in a point or sharp angle" by the *Encarta*

World Dictionary (<http://dictionary.msn.com/find/entry.asp?search=pointed>). In addition, one of the definitions of "apex" is "the tip or top of something, especially something that is pointed, for example, a triangle" (<http://dictionary.msn.com/find/entry.asp?search=apex>). Thus, the combination of these two words clearly differentiates this element of claim 31 from the Szapucki reference, as a "half-cylinder" would not fall within these definitions. Accordingly, the claim, as amended, is in a condition for allowance. Likewise, claim 32, which depends on claim 31, is also in a condition for allowance.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 29977US1.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

May 25, 2001